

SLOBODAN DUŠANIĆ  
Filozofski fakultet  
Beograd

UDC 930.271(497)

### MOESIA AND PANNONIA IN DOMITIAN'S LAST WAR ON THE DANUBE

*Abstract.* *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI 29, 31, 36, 42 i 63 ukazuju da je Scupi bio vojnički logor i, povremeno, mesto carskog štaba tokom Domicijanovih ratova na Dunavu (up. Cass. Dio LXVII 6, 3). Nedovršenost natpisa br. 29 i 63 dâ se tumačiti Domicijanovom *damnatio memoriae* 96. g.; postoje i druge indicije o visokoj koncentraciji trupa na mezijско-panonskom prostoru krajem Domicijanove vlade a razlog tome je rat protiv Sarmata c. 95—96. g. Honorand natpisa br. 63 poticao je iz Faustianuma u južnoj Panoniji; njegova zasluga za Scupi je verovatno stajala u vezi s prebacivanjem jedne veksilacije leg. XIV Gemina iz Skupa u okolinu Siscije.

An Upper Moesian auxiliary diploma of July 12, 96, has given rise to the hypothesis that there was a Sarmatian campaign on the Pannonico—Moesian frontier at the end of Domitian's reign (c. A. D. 95—96)<sup>1</sup>. Two facts have suggested such a conclusion. On the one hand, the high concentration of auxilia in Moesia Superior (c. 23 units registered by the diplomata from the last decade of the first century), significantly coinciding with a close collaboration between the then garrisons of the two provinces<sup>2</sup>; on the other, the well-known hono-

<sup>1</sup> S. Dušanić and M. R. Vasić, *Chiron* 7, 1977, 291—304. The text of the bronze figures in M. M. Roxan's *Roman Military Diplomas 1954—1977* (London 1978) as no. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the temporary transfers of *auxilia* (*Chiron*, *loc. cit.*, 296ff.; obviously, ala Praetoria and the cohorts V Gallorum and I Montanorum left Pannonia for Moesia c. 86, together with the governor L. Funisulanus Vettonianus, whose new posting should also be ascribed „an der Neueinrichtung der Provinz [Moes. Sup.] sowie an der militärische Lage infolge des Dakerkrieges“ [W. Eck, *Chiron* 12, 1982, 312 n. 127]), and the moves of the legions such as XIII Gemina, dealt with in the present paper. I am inclined now to treat the *legiones quinque* of ILS 2719 (if Satrius' service therein fell under Domitian, not Trajan) as an expeditionary corps made up of troops of the two provinces (Pannonia and Moesia), not Pannonia only, and concede Moesia a greater role in the events of 95—96 than was done in 1977 (contrast *Chiron*, *loc. cit.*, 302f. 304).

rary inscription from Tifernum Mataurense, dedicated *L. Aconio L. f. Clu(stumina) Staturae, (centurioni) leg. XI C(laudiae) p.f., leg. IIII F(laviae) f., leg. V Maced(onicae), leg. VII C(laudiae) p.f., doni<s> donato ab Imp. Traiano Aug. Germ. ob bellum Dacic. torquib. armill. phaleris corona vallar., et a priorib. principibus eisdem [do]nis donato o[b]ellum Germa. et Sarmatic. (CIL XI 5992)*. „As K. Patsch observed, the *bellum Dacicum* means here the war of 101—102 and the *bellum Germanicum et Sarmaticum* the wars of Domitian and Nerva, the *priores principes*, taken together; Statura probably earned his first *dona* in the *legio IIII Flavia*, his second, in the *legio VII Claudia*. Both Patsch and his followers in the interpretation of the text understand the *bellum Germanicum et Sarmaticum* as referring to some continuous hostilities on the northern frontier of Pannonia in 92—97, though these have not been recorded for the years 93—96. .<sup>3</sup> To assume a Sarmatian episode immediately preceding Nerva's Germanic War would be a much more plausible solution, fitting a number of indications concerning the Pannonian—Moesian troops and commanders in 96<sup>4</sup>. Accordingly, the two-phase operations labelled by Statura as a *bellum Germanicum et Sarmaticum* will have started c. 95—96, around Singidunum<sup>5</sup>, against the Iazyges, and developed into the *victoria Germanica* of the summer/autumn of 97, won somewhere in the north of the Pannonian *limes* against the Suebi<sup>6</sup>. The shift of the war scene was obviously provoked by the activities of a wide barbarian alliance in 96—97 — „comparable to the common cause made by the Germanic and Sarmatian tribes in 92“ — and had as a consequence the transfer of two, perhaps more, Pannonian legions from the south of the province to the Vindobona — Aquincum sector<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. not in the north of Pannonia; even the *bellum Sarmaticum* around Singidunum will have begun *after* early 95, to judge from *Stat. Silv.* IV 1, 14 (cf. e.g. E. Köstlin, *Die Donaukriege Domitians*, Diss. Tübingen 1910, 84 with n. 4).

<sup>4</sup> *Chiron, loc. cit.*, 299f. The closing phrase alludes to the transfers of Pompeius Longinus (coinciding with Hadrian's appointment as a *laticlavus* to the Lower Moesian V Macedonica *extremis Domitiani temporibus* [*HA, v. Hadr.* 2, 3], itself a consequence of the arrival of another new governor to the Danube?) and some of his Upper Moesian soldiers from Moesia to Pannonia in about August, 96 (for the cohorts I Montanorum and I Lusitanorum in the diploma discussed and *ILS* 2720, *Chiron, loc. cit.*, 303). Cf. *supra*, n. 2, and *infra*, n. 44.

<sup>5</sup> The fortress of Statura's IIII Flavia and, probably, the scene of Dio Chrysostomus' description, 12, 16—20 (*Chiron, loc. cit.*, 295 n. 24, 302 n. 72, 304 n. 80). The Sarmatian threat from the south of the Banat no doubt demanded concerted efforts on the part of units stationed in south-eastern Pannonia and the Upper Moesian *limes* from Singidunum to Viminacium or Cuppae (cf. the course of Constantine's action in 322: *Opt. Porf.* VI 18ff.).

<sup>6</sup> *Plin. Pan.* 8, 2, cf. A. Mócsy, *RE Suppl.* IX (1962) 552. — As to the *bellum Germanicum et Sarmaticum* of *CIL* XI 5992, note the singular number of the noun (indicative of the continuity of struggles of 95/96—97) and the chronologically inverse order of the adjectives, depending on the structure of the whole phrase (Trajan cited first, then the *priores principes*).

<sup>7</sup> I and II Adiutrix, possibly also XIII Gemina.

The foregoing inferences appear to me now all the more probable as the *ob virtutem* theory concerning the issue of diplomata<sup>8</sup> tends to reveal, behind the grant of July 12, 96<sup>9</sup>, a major fighting success of the *exercitus Moesiae Superioris*<sup>10</sup>; the success may be identified with the first phase of Staturo's composite war and put not long before the day of the promulgation of the *constitutio*. But the rich epigraphical heritage of Scupi — conveniently accessible of late through the „Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure“, vol. VI (ed. Borka Dragojević-Josifovska) — seems to offer more concrete arguments in support of the reality of the events under discussion.

Five Scupian inscriptions are of a special, if neglected, interest for the military history of Domitian's last years. Four of them pertain to legionaries, veteran or active, one to a civilian (whose [hypothetical] role in the moves of troops in 96 will be dealt with at the end of the present note)<sup>11</sup>:

(a) *M. Insteio* | *M. f. Scap(tia)* | *Valenti p(rimi)p(ilo)* | *praef. leg. III Aug(ustae)*. Probably unfinished (fig. 1)<sup>12</sup>.

(b) *T. Turrano* | *L. f. Sergia* | *Proculo* | *Flan(ona) primip(ilo)* | *praef. castror.* | *leg. XIII Gem(inae)* | *IIvir(o) q(uin)q(uennali) col(oniae)* | *Fl(aviae) Scupinor(um)* | *L. Valerius Ius*<sup>10</sup> | *tus amico l.* | *d. d. d.*

(c) --- | *Aniensis Fo[ro] Iulio mil.* | *leg. I Ital[ic]ae* | *h. s. e.* | *annor. XVIII* | *L. Octavius* | *Pulcher (centurio)* | *leg. I Ital[ic]ae cognato* | *suo fecit.*

(d) *M. Octavius* | *M. f. Aemil(ia) Valens* | *Stobis mil. leg. V Macedo(nicae) decu.* | *pontif. col. Fl(aviae) f(elicis) D(ardanorum)* | *vivos fecit sibi* | *Octaviae Marcellinae* | *filiae suae defunctae* | *vixit annis XXVI et Catiae* | *Secundae coniugi suae* | *hic se vivo* | *f.c.*

(e) *T. Statilio T. f.* | *Tauro Quir(ina)* | *Faustiniano* | *ornat. a splen*<sup>5</sup> | *didiss. ordin.* | *Scup(inorum) ornamentis*. Certainly unfinished (fig. 2)<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> ZPE 47, 1982, 149ff.

<sup>9</sup> One *ala* and ten cohorts, of which two at least participated in Nerva's *bellum Suebicum* (above, n. 4).

<sup>10</sup> The low number of equites among the beneficiaries of the *constitutio* shows that no distant campaign was in question; massive use of cavalry in the marshy Banat of that epoch seems to have been undesirable.

<sup>11</sup> *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* (Belgrade 1982) nos. 29 (= our a), 31 (= b), 36 (= c), 42 (= d), 63 (= e), all with photos. (D) has been known since *Ann. ép.* 1910, 173; others are recent acquisitions, published for the first time in 1974, 1971, 1970 and 1977 respectively.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the editor's remarks: „L'inscription semble incomplète. Le dédicant n'y est pas mentionné et la hauteur des lettres diminue sans raison visible (in our opinion, the *ordinatio* had planned one more line, with the dedicator's name(s): *col. Scupi* [*ordo col. Scupin.* vel sim.] rather than personal names). On a l'impression que le lapicide a interrompu la gravure“.

<sup>13</sup> Professor B. Dragojević-Josifovska notes *ad num.*: „L'inscription a été laissée incomplète, pour des raisons inconnues. On s'attendrait à lire à la fin: *ob multa eius merita*, comme dans les inscriptions sus-mentionnées du municipe d'Ulpiana. . . , ou une autre formule semblable“. We believe that line 7 should have included the word *decurionalibus*, entire or abbreviated (cf. *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* 69, referred to in the commentary ad no. 63), and that the end of the inscription contained the name(s) of the dedicator. See, however, *infra*, n. 33.

Judging from their epigraphical characteristics (formulae and lettering), the texts quoted must be rather early<sup>14</sup>. To those citing the colony of Scupi (*b*, *d*, *e*), the beginning of Vespasian's reign, which saw the foundation of the Dardanian city<sup>15</sup>, provides a *terminus post quem*. There is no firm *terminus ante* and, of course, the five monuments need not all have been contemporaneous. However, the remarkable presence of soldiers belonging to the legions whose camps normally lay outside of (Upper) Moesia, c. A.D. 70—120 at least<sup>16</sup>, implies a season of important operations on the mid-Danubian limes, which involved the detachment of strong vexillations. Within the period compatible with the formal features of our documents, only two such possibilities offer themselves: Domitian's wars of 83—92 (96) and Trajan's expeditions against Decebalus. Certain traits of (*a*), (*c*) and (*d*) would favour the earlier occasion<sup>17</sup>; as we shall try to show, more indications could be adduced to the same effect though, naturally, some of the units sent to Illyricum from distant countries under Domitian may have remained in their new posts throughout till A.D. 107 or its vicinity.

In the case of (*a*), however, Professor B. Dragojević-Josifovska is inclined to adhere to the latter date<sup>18</sup>. She refers to E. Ritterling's conjecture, based upon an interpretation of a scene on Trajan's column, that III Augusta joined Trajan in 105, on his way to Dacia<sup>19</sup>. The underlying interpretation of this particular relief being untenable, the

<sup>14</sup> For two items, the editor of *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* proposes more precise dates, on inadequate grounds: (*b*) (*ad num.*: „D'après le titre *praefectus castrorum*, l'inscription est à dater après le règne de Domitien. . .“) and (*c*) (p. 24: c. A.D. 70, I Italica „fit un arrêt plus ou moins prolongé à Scupi“ on her way from Dyrrachium to Novae; but no. 37, the gravestone of the legion's veteran [his name formula is also early], suggests a less causal link between I Italica and Scupi). On (*a*), see *infra*.

<sup>15</sup> E. Ritterling, *RE* XII (1924) 1274f. 1621, cf. *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI*, p. 25f.

<sup>16</sup> I.e. at Theveste (III Augusta), Novae (I Italica), Oescus (V Macedonica) and in south-eastern Pannonia (XIII Gemina, see below, n. 39) respectively. See e.g. Ritterling, *loc. cit.*, 1267ff. *et passim*.

<sup>17</sup> Note the abbreviation *D* ( ) in line 5 of (*d*), which used to be expanded *D(omitiana)* before a fresh find disclosed *Dardanorum* as the correct reading (*Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* 15 and p. 25f.; cf. Ptol. III 9, 4); that title of Scupi does not seem to have survived into the second century (cf. *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI*, p. 78, ad no. 46), perhaps because of Trajan's change of the status of Dardania within Moesia Superior (the foundation of Ulpiana and of the (metalli Ulpiani) Dardanici). Lines 7—10 of (*d*) may have been later than the rest of the inscription but the chronology of Octavius Valens' family life remains obscure (the uncertainty as to the veteran status of his — see below, n. 23 — presents an additional complication): his marriage and the birth of Marcellina may have taken place before his recruitment into V Macedonica as well as after his discharge. — As regards the other two monuments, the letter-forms (especially the very open *P*'s) of (*a*) and the genitive formula *ammor. XVIII* (contrast e.g. *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* 39, lines 5—7: c. A.D. 70 ?) of (*c*) render a Domitianic date much more attractive than a Trajanic one.

<sup>18</sup> *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* p. 65, cf. ead., *Mélanges helléniques offerts à Georges Daux*, Paris 1974, 190.

<sup>19</sup> Ritterling, *loc. cit.*, 1282 and 1489, citing A. von Domaszewski, *Philologus* 65, 1906, 338.



Fig. 1 Scupi. *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI 29.

Fig. 2 Scupl. Inscr. Més. Sup. VI 63.



whole combination loses its support<sup>20</sup>. And Domitian certainly received some African reinforcements for his Danubian wars<sup>21</sup>, of which Jordanes wrote, not without good reasons, the famous *totius paene rei publicae militibus*. . . (Get. XIII 77). If, by itself, the continuous stay of III Augusta on the Danube through the period of c. 83—107 remains a possibility, and, on the other hand, an early Hadrianic date for (a) should theoretically also be admitted<sup>22</sup>, the affinities of M. Insteius Valens' monument to (b) and (e) make us place it somewhere in August—September, 96.

Namely, our choice between the chronological contexts attributable to the inscriptions in question must take into account the nature and length of the legionaries' presence at Scupi. Both the occurrence of the *praefertus castrorum* (*praefectus legionis*) in (b) ([a]) and the — rather surprising<sup>23</sup> — municipal career of Turranius Proculus and Octavius Valens<sup>24</sup> reveal a protracted stay, which deeply influen-

<sup>20</sup> Cf. e.g. K. Patsch, *SB. Ak. Wien* 217 (1937) 96 n. 3; A. Garzetti, *From Tiberius to the Antonines*, London 1974, 325, 667f. 677f.

<sup>21</sup> At least the coh. XIII Urbana from Carthage, *ILS* 2127 (cf. *IGLSyr.* 2796). See the bibliography in Zs. Visy, *Acta arch. Hung.* 30, 1978, 49ff., whose idea of placing that cohort in Italy (? Puteoli) for the Vespasian—Domitian period should not be retained, for more than one reason. Also, *Arh. Vestnik* (Ljubljana) 33, 1982, 539 and 540 n. 11.

<sup>22</sup> On *CIL* VIII 18085 see Ritterling, *loc. cit.*, 1499f.; Patsch, *loc. cit.*, 161 n.l.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. the apt remark by Dragojević-Josifovska, *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI p. 67 (ad b), „On ne voit pas pourquoi il (Turranius Proculus) a choisi pour domicile Scupi et non une autre ville romaine plus proche des lieux de sa provenance (Flanona belonged to Liburnia) et de son service militaire (i.e. Pannonia, according to the traditional reconstruction of the history of XIII Gemina after its departure from Germany in A. D. 92)“. Obviously, the eccentricity of Turranius' choice of Scupi — not quite accidental, to judge from the *duumvirate* he reached there — is only apparent: he must have served for some time in that city, probably under Domitian, as the evidence discussed in the present paper would suggest. Octavius Valens' case is similar (cf. above, n. 16), but less striking as the Macedonian municipium *Stobensium* lay not far from Scupi. If the *miles* of his tombstone (d, line 3) is interpreted as implying that he was an active soldier while the municipal magistrate at Scupi (the opinion of Ritterling, *RE* XII 1275, and Dragojević-Josifovska, *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI, p. 75, but open to doubts), we should obtain a further proof of the military role of Scupi at the end of the first century; at any event, it is to be noted that the *Catii* are not otherwise attested in the Scupian epigraphy, which does not recommend the idea to put Octavius' choice of Scupi down to the provenance of his wife.

<sup>24</sup> Paralleled perhaps by *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI 15, where the end of line 2 (recording an *a commentariis* ?), unexplained so far, may reveal a career similar to that of a *beneficiarius legati consularis* who also became a *quaestor* and *duumvir* of the *colonia Flavia felix Dardanorum* (note the chronological indication furnished by this last attribute), *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI 46. It is doubtful whether the two *ex-principales* of nos. 15 and 46 would have risen to the highest rank of the Flavian colony's dignitaries without a period of service at Scupi prior to their *honesta missio*. — Line 4 of *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI 46 deserves a further word of comment here: the '*BMV E leg. consula*' of its not blameless copy (the stone itself has disappeared) has been read by R. Syme (*Danubian Papers*, Bucharest 1971, 215, *b(eneficiarius) M(arci) V(alerii) E(trusci)*) and dated c. 156—158/159. Epigraphically, this would be too late for the formulae of no. 46 (as Professor Dragojević-Josifovska appropriately glosses, proposing an implausible *beneficiarius munifex leg. consula*.) but the idea

ced the life of the city. To put it simply, Scupi must have served, for several years, as the base of more than one legionary vexillatio. Such a state of affairs is hardly compatible with Trajan's aggressive operations, led from the camps situated on the *ripa Dunuvii* itself or to the north of it<sup>25</sup>. On the contrary, Domitian preferred, in 86 at least, to locate his quarters in an inland city of Moesia<sup>26</sup>. This formed a part of his decision, severely criticized in hostile historiography, to commit himself to debauchery while leaving the front command to Cornelius Fuscus. It seems curious that no modern scholar has identified Dio's *πόλις* with Scupi; Naissus has generally appeared the most appropriate candidate<sup>27</sup>. Scupi, nonetheless, carried two distinct advantages, being safer<sup>28</sup> and less inconsistent with the Flavian's luxurious habits: the contrast between a Vespasianic colony and a settlement to become a *municipium c. A.D. 200* only<sup>29</sup>, cannot be overstressed in this connection<sup>30</sup>.

Once established at Scupi, Domitian's staff for the Danubian wars — necessarily important in size and organization — was likely to reappear there in 88—89 and 92, during the periods of the Emperor's second and third stays *apud Illyrios*. The city may also have served as a winter camp for some troops of the already overgarrisoned frontier of Moesia—Pannonia<sup>31</sup>. Only the shift of gravity of the great operations from Moesia to Pannonia (first to the south, then to the

---

of finding there the legate's *tria nomina* radically abbreviated must be sound. I should venture *b(eneficiarius) M(arci) U(lpii) <T>(raiani) (or <Tr>(aiani)* with *T, R* in a ligature which would explain the letter-space left vacant in the copy); the possibility of assigning Trajan a Danubian province during Domitian's wars in Illyricum has been recommended by several scholars, notably by R. Syme himself. As the *beneficium* was accorded to the soldier of VII Claudia, Trajan's governorship would have occurred in Moesia Superior, *c. 92—93* (without knowing *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI 46*, T. Nagy [*Trajan und Pannonien*, paper read to the Limes Congress at Aalen in September, 1983] proposed Pannonia *c. 95* but the chances that VII Claudia, whole or in part, was there at that time are quite slight).

<sup>25</sup> See e.g. Patsch, *op. cit.*, 70, 87, 104; Garzetti, *op. cit.*, 318 ff.

<sup>26</sup> Cass. Dio LXVII 6,3: ἐν πόλει τινὶ Μυσίας.

<sup>27</sup> A.v. Premerstein, *Oest. Jahresh.* 6, 1903, Beibl. 45; Patsch, *loc. cit.*, 6; R. Hanslik, *Der Kleine Pauly* 2 (1975) 123, and many others.

<sup>28</sup> Contrast Tac. *Agr.* 41: *de hibernis legionum ... dubitatum*.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. P. Petrović, *Inscr. Més. Sup. IV* (1979) p. 50f.

<sup>30</sup> On the comparatively high standard of living at Scupi see *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* p. 30ff. and *passim*. It may be doubted whether Dio or his source could apply the term *polis* to a place without city status; before Trajan, there were no other *municipia* or *coloniae c. R.* in Moesia (Superior).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Chiron, *loc. cit.*, 298, where already the use of forts in the interior of Moesia Superior has been assumed for the closing years of Domitian's reign, „since the total of . . . units must have by far surpassed the space normally available“ in the auxiliary *castella* on the limes. Such a state of affairs must have contributed to Domitian's decision to burden a colony with a legionary garrison; almost certainly, Scupi had been a legionary fortress during the pre-Flavian epoch (*Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* p. 24 n. 12). While (a)–(e) seem to reflect the sojourn, at Scupi, of the legionary vexillations rather than that of the imperial staff, the case of the *officiales* recorded in *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* 15 and 46 (above, n. 24) will be the opposite.



north of the latter province) could free the Scupians from their unrewarding task of keeping Domitian's soldiers. According to the deductions set forth in the *Chiron* article cited above, that transfer must have taken place *extremis Domitiani temporibus* (cf. *HA*, v. *Hadr.* 2,3), in August of 96 approximately<sup>32</sup>. Though it is difficult to propose with confidence a precise date, within the 80's — 90's, for any of the military episodes alluded to in our five inscriptions, the fact that (e), probably (a) too, remained uncompleted suggests the same time, near to the Emperor's end (Sept. 18, 96); furthermore, it indirectly attests the continuation of the hostilities along the Upper Moesian *limes* beyond 94/95 (in other words, corroborates our view on Statua's *bellum Sarmaticum*) as there must have been some reasons for such a late concentration of the legionary *vexillationes* in Dardania. To be sure, other explanations might be found for the unfinished state of these (costly enough<sup>33</sup>) monuments but the simplest solution seems to be to put it down to the events leading to Domitian's *damnatio memoriae*<sup>34</sup>. More specifically, his disappearance provoked an (unsympathetic) reevaluation of the Flavian military achievements, so typical of the literary production in the years immediately following<sup>35</sup>. The praise of the roles M. Insteius Valens and T. Statilius Taurus played at Scupi would have been out of place in such a situation, for considerations not merely politico-administrative in character<sup>36</sup>.

A brief commentary on (e) is indispensable here. The editor of *Inscr. Mes. Sup. VI* treats the *Faustiniano* as Statilius' second *cognomen*; that would, however, imply the impossible position of the tribe abbreviation between the two *cognomina*. Rather, the name formula

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Eck, *Chiron* 12, 1982, 327 n. 178.

<sup>33</sup> (A) has been described as a „plaque en marbre blanc (72 × 66 × 18 cm)“, (e) as a „base en calcaire blanc (106 × 48 × 34,5 cm)“ whose „sommet porte des acrotères et une petite base ronde... décorée de pampres, excavée pour l'emplacement de la statue“. Professor F. Papazoglou has kindly drawn my attention to the possibility that the engraver of (e) abandoned his work only because he realized that the *Quir.* was misplaced (line 2*fin.* instead of line 2*init.*, which would be normal if the *Faustiniano* represents a *cognomen*, not an *origo* as argued *infra*). If her proposal proves right, our interpretation of the inscription should be discarded.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. e.g., on a much larger scale, the case of the *Cancellaria* reliefs in Rome (Garzetti, *op. cit.*, 650f.). It should be remembered that not only (e) but also (a) may have belonged to a monument supporting a statue.

<sup>35</sup> See e.g. Syme, *Tacitus*, I, Oxford 1958, 47ff. 122ff. 129; id., *Roman Papers*, I, Oxford 1979, 77f. 83.

<sup>36</sup> The better fate of (b) probably implies a different date of that monument (earlier — or later enough to reflect a period during which Domitian's memory appeared less hateful than before) or, possibly, was due to the fact that its dedicatory was an individual, not an official body (as in the original text of a and e?). Though the exact chronology of the inscriptions analyzed here cannot be established as yet, I should put them (on diverse criteria) into the following sequence: (c) — the 80's/very beginning of the 90's? ('epigraphical' indications, the formula *annorum* in the first place), (d), *Inscr. Més. Sup. VI* 15 and 46 — still Domitianic? (the attribute *Dardanorum*; if our reading of no. 46, line 4, is correct, c. A. D. 92—93 would provide a *terminus post*), (a) and (e) — August-September, 96? (not finished), (b) — post-Domitianic? (the *Dardanorum* is missing among the names of the colony).

ends with the *tribus* and *origo*, as in many other instances<sup>37</sup>. The municipium Faustinianum lay somewhere in the neighbourhood of Siscia (perhaps in the Savus valley between, say, Siscia and Servitium)<sup>38</sup>, in an area which garrisoned XIII Gemina before A.D. 97<sup>39</sup>; if his family's citizenship is traced back to T. Statilius Taurus (*cos. ord.* II 26 B.C.), Augustus' general in Illyricum in 34—33 B.C.<sup>40</sup>, the near Siscian *origo* of the honorand becomes all the more understandable<sup>41</sup>. Several circumstances concur in indicating a public service connected with XIII Gemina and done by the notable from Faustinianum. Probably, he had performed something like an expeditionary *annona*<sup>42</sup> for the vexillation of XIII Gemina (re)turning from Scupi to southern

<sup>37</sup> See, at Scupi, our (c) and *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI 62.

<sup>38</sup> *CIL* III 3974 (Siscia), cf. Mócsy, *loc. cit.*, 600 (in the future Pannonia Superior, *CIL* VI 2494a). The *Quirina* indicates a municipium Flavium (Professor B. Dragojević-Josifovska thought of the colonia Scupi), a new fact. Probably, Faustinianum received that promotion c. A.D. 70, as did Neviodunum and Andautonia, in the same valley upstream of Siscia. This must have been Vespasian's reward for the pro-Flavian attitude of the people of Faustinianum in the Civil War, both the sailors and the civilians (the latter may well have accepted Vespasian's army on its way to Italy), cf. e.g. Mócsy, *loc. cit.*, 597; J. Šašel, *La fondazione delle città Flavie quale espressione di gratitudine politica*, in: *La città antica come fatto di cultura*, Como 1982, 1ff. — Was there any connection between Pontius Lupus, Augustalis of Siscia and scribe of Faustinianum (*CIL* III 3974), and the family of the Pontii possessing large estates in Dardania?

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *CIL* III 3755 (a brickstamp from Petrieveci = Mursella) and Ritterling, *loc. cit.*, 1736; *Chiron, loc. cit.*, 302 with n. 68. The camp itself has been variously identified, mainly Mursa or Mursella. Siscia with its immediate vicinity is also an attractive possibility, *infra*, notes 44f.

<sup>40</sup> On him, Nagl, *RE* III A (1929) 2201, 2203; Taurus' warfare in Illyricum of 34—33 B.C. brought him some important estates in the Illyrian south. That circumstance was bound to propagate the *nomen Statilium* in the country, among the consular's freedmen (cf. Nagl, *loc. cit.*) as well as among his clients. It is difficult to say to which of these two lineages the Taurus of (e) belonged. The latter's *cognomen* would speak rather for a descendant of a *peregrinus* (cf. Syme, *Historia* 13, 1964, 163f.; *Danubian Papers*, 211) but the alternative of a great-grandson of the general's *libertus* should not be ruled out; at the distance of four generations (or even lesser: e.g. *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI 146 records a *liberta* whose daughter bears the *cognomen* derived from that of the *patronus*), the adoption of the *cognomen* of the family's *patronus* would not seem offensive. If the Scupian inscription refers to the *ornamenta decurionalia* (above, n. 13), that could be a sign of the honorand's low origin (cf. S. Borszák, *RE* XVIII, 1942, col. 1120; Dragojević-Josifovska, *Inscr. Més. Sup.* VI 69 comm.).

<sup>41</sup> With regard to the importance of Siscia in the events of 35—33 B. C. and Taurus' position in Illyricum after Octavian's departure at the close of 34 (largely analogous to the position of a provincial governor, which also included the right to transmit his *nomen* to his clients), it would not surprise us if there were many Statilii of non-Roman birth in the neighbourhood of Siscia. The affinity of our honorand to the famous senatorial family has already been recognized by Professor Dragojević-Josifovska, though not its historico-geographical context as surmised here.

<sup>42</sup> Which may have been organized and financed by private persons too, A. Passerini, *Diz. ep.* IV 622.

Pannonia<sup>43</sup>, possibly Siscia itself<sup>44</sup> (the find-spot of *CIL* XVI 46 may prove significant in this connection<sup>45</sup>); the presence of the legion's *vexillarii* in the Dardanian city is indicated by (b) but ended, we may conjecture, in ?August, 96, approximately<sup>46</sup>. If our deductions from (a)—(e) are accepted, all the three honorary inscriptions from the series (a, b, e) were, naturally enough, to people who were able, thanks to their official positions, to help Scupi in its role, difficult in a variety of ways, of a large military base in Domitian's Danubian wars<sup>47</sup>.

Примљено 5. априла 1983.

<sup>43</sup> We must reckon with the possibility that, in 92, a part of XIII Gemina was transported to Pannonia, the rest to Moesia.

<sup>44</sup> A major fortress in the Julio-Claudian period, Šašel, *RE* Supplb. XIV (1974) 734f.

<sup>45</sup> That diploma's recipient, a Cilician, member of an Upper Moesian unit, took Siscia for his after-*missio* abode (A. D. 100). Such a departure from the usual practice (the find-spots of diplomata mainly coincide with the beneficiaries' places of origin or regular service, M. Roxan, *Ep. Studien* 12, 1981, 279ff.) tends to reflect the recipients' participation in a distant *expeditio belli* at a moment close to the issue of the *constitutio* (to remain with Domitian's wars on the Danube, cf. the find-spots of *CIL* XVI 28 and 33). Obviously, Siscia was a military base in the *bellum Germanicum et Sarmaticum* of Nerva and Domitian, which seems to have been the 'qualifying event' (on the notion, *ZPE* 47, 1982, 149ff.) for the beneficiaries of *CIL* XVI 42 and 46, and *RMD* 6. Mrs. Roxan comments upon the provenance of XVI 46 thus: „[the find-spot] may be explained as lying in [the] province (Pannonia in this case) where the units of the men concerned had previously been stationed“ but the cohort of the recipient of that document, I Antiochensium, had entered the *exercitus Moesiae* by A.D. 75 (*RMD* 2).

<sup>46</sup> *Supra*, notes 2 and 4f. We cannot be sure about the then destination of III Augusta and I Italica.

<sup>47</sup> The author is grateful to Professors F. Papazoglou and W. Eck for useful comments and criticism. Neither of these scholars, however, should be taken to agree with the views expressed in the present paper.